REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the amendments made herein and the following remarks.

Claims 1-32 are pending, with Claims 1, 4, 11, 13, 19, 23, 31 and 32 being independent.

Claims 1, 3, 11, 19, 21, 22 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Canon* (JP 10-254708 A), hereinafter *Canon*, in view of *Harding* (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,052), hereinafter *Harding*. Claims 2, 12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Canon* in view of *Harding* and further in view of *Garney* (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,850), hereinafter *Garney*. Claims 4, 5, 10, 13, 14, 23, 24, 29, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harding* in view of *Canon*. Claims 6-8, 15-17 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harding* in view of *Canon* and further in view of *Hanson* (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,346), hereinafter *Hanson*. Claims 9, 18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harding* in view of *Canon* and further in view of *Garney*.

The present application is directed to driver installation on a computer. An object of the present invention is to avoid selection of an incorrect driver or setup information by a user, *i.e.*, a driver with incorrect regional information.

Presently, Claim 1 defines a method for installing a printer driver stored on a recording medium on a computer terminal comprising:

1) a step of referring to regional information identifying a particular region, that regional information being set in said computer terminal in advance;

2) a selecting step of automatically selecting one of multiple printer drivers stored on said recording medium on the basis of the referred to regional information,

3) the multiple printer drivers corresponding to multiple different regions, respectively; and

4) a step of installing the selected printer driver on the computer terminal.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 11, 19, 21 and 31 over *Canon* in view of *Harding*

Canon discloses a method of software installation depending on the region to which the equipment is being shipped. Each destination region has a corresponding support center. Each support center is provided with region dependent software, *e.g.*, device drivers. Beginning on Page 2, line 16, *Canon* describes that the PC 100 has a modem 101 built into it, and that the user of the PC 100 turns it on while the modem 101 is connected to the circuit 120. Once the PC 100 is turned on, based on the regional information, *e.g.*, UK, USA, FR, GR, etc., the PC 100 makes a phone call to the particular support center corresponding to the designated region and gets the driver corresponding to the region. See page 3, lines 15-19.

In addition to the region dependent drivers stored in the support centers, *Canon* discusses "common" software that is stored on the PC 100. The common software depends only on the language and ***not the regions***. See page 4, line 1-2. Page 5, lines 11-17 of *Canon* describes that the software installation unit 106 installs the common preinstall software 107, which is stored in the memory unit 108, that depends only on the language, and ***not on the region***. The Official Action recognizes that *Canon* at least fails to disclose the claimed features relating to

multiple print drivers corresponding to multiple different regions respectively. For a disclosure of that subject matter, *Harding* is relied upon.

Harding discloses a situation where computers are shipped to persons speaking different languages. Problems arise when installation prompts on the computer are in a language different than that spoken by the user. Therefore, as described beginning in column 6, line 16, of *Harding*, prior to shipping, the computer manufacturer installs modules of MS-DOS and Windows for every possible language. Those modules (device operating system and graphical interface) are compressed, since multiple uncompressed copies in various languages would require large amounts of hard disk space. Also, various device driver modules corresponding to the installed hardware components in the computer system model being shipped are exploded and downloaded onto the computer system's hard disk drive (column 6, lines 25-28). ***After startup***, the end user is prompted to select a ***language*** and a corresponding keyboard configuration. Upon selection of a ***language***, the software setup program begins converting the ***operation language*** of the computer system to the user selected language (column 6, lines 42-44). That is, the user selected language versions of the DOS (device operating system) and Windows (graphical interface) module are exploded (column 6, lines 45-46). Any files that are independent of the operating language chosen (*e.g.*, device drivers) are also exploded and downloaded by the computer manufacturer (column 6, lines 61-68). As stated in column 7, lines 22-26 (emphasis added), "[s]ince the ***device driver files are independent of the user selected language***, they are installed at the factory to minimize later setup time. There are no corresponding files for the device driver files in the user selected language versions of DOS and Windows." Figure 3

in *Harding* shows that in step 510 the drivers are installed and that in subsequent step 530 the user is prompted to select a language. That is, the device drivers do not correspond to geographic regions, nor to selected languages.

Claim 1 is allowable because neither *Harding* nor *Canon* disclose multiple printer drivers that are stored on a recording medium. Should the rejection be maintained, it is requested that it be explained how the cited documents disclose or suggest multiple **printer** drivers stored on a recoding medium.

Claim 1 is also allowable at least because neither *Canon* nor *Harding* disclose the claimed subject matter relating to multiple printer **drivers that correspond to multiple different regions** stored on a recording medium. For example, *Canon* dials a specific telephone number to a support center that only has drivers for one region available. Therefore, *Canon* does not have multiple printer drivers corresponding to multiple regions stored on a recording medium. *Harding* discloses that the drivers are installed in the factory and have nothing to do with regional information, or language information. Therefore, *Harding* also does not disclose multiple printer drivers corresponding to multiple geographic regions stored on a recoding medium, as recited in Claim 1. *Harding* does refer to selection of language, however, as noted above, a selected language is not a region because, for example, England and the US both use English, but may require different setup information, for example A4 paper default setting in England and 8 ½ by 11 inch paper default setting in the US. Further, even if, *arguendo*, a language did relate to a geographic region, *Harding* discloses that the drivers in the computer are **independent** of the user selected language. In column 7, lines 22-26 (emphasis added), *Harding* states

that "[s]ince the device driver files are *independent of the user selected language*, they are installed at the factory to minimize later setup time."

Further, there would have been no motivation to alter the aspect of *Canon* relating to calling the support centers and downloading the region specific driver in view of *Harding*, because *Harding* discloses exploding different software *based on a selected language* and *Canon* discloses that the language dependent software is contained within the PC 100 and *are not drivers*. Therefore, a skilled person presented with the two references, would not have been directed to alter *Canon's* procurement of drivers from a support center based on *Harding's* installation of software (not drivers) based on language, and would not have been directed to combine or alter *Canon* as suggested in the official action.

For at least those reasons, Claims 1 is allowable. Claims 11, 19 and 31 are allowable for similar reasons with regard to similar claim language.

Claims 3 and 21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence upon allowable independent claims.

Rejections of Claims 2, 12 and 20 over *Canon* in view of *Harding* in view of *Garney*

Claims 2, 12 and 20 depend from allowable independent Claims 1, 11 and 19, respectively. *Garney* does not remedy the deficiencies of the rejections of those claims, and Claims 2, 12 and 20 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

<u>Rejections of Claims 4, 5, 10, 13, 14, 23, 24, 29, 30 and 32 over *Harding* in view of *Canon.*</u>

Claim 4, defines a method for installing a printer driver stored on a recording medium on a computer terminal, comprising:

1) a step of referring to regional information identifying a particular region, the regional information being set in said computer terminal in advance;

2) a selection step of automatically selecting a piece of setup information from multiple pieces of setup information stored on said recording medium on the basis of the referred to regional information, the multiple pieces of setup information corresponding to multiple different regions, respectively; and

3) a step of installing a control program contained in the printer driver and the selected piece of setup information on the computer terminal.

The descriptions of *Harding* and *Canon* are not repeated for sake of brevity.

Claim 4 is allowable at least because neither *Canon* nor *Harding* disclose the claimed subject matter relating to multiple pieces of setup information stored on a recording medium, the multiple pieces of setup information corresponding to multiple different regions, respectively. *Harding* does not disclose setup information that corresponds to a region. The Official Action identifies the selection of language in *Harding* (column 6, lines 39-41 and column 13, lines 5-10) as corresponding to the regional information. However, as noted above, a selected language is not a region in the context of the present application. That is, England and the US both use English, but may require different setup information, for example A4 paper default setting in England and 8 ½ by 11 inch paper default setting in the US. Also, *Canon* does not disclose setup information that corresponds to a particular region that is

stored on a recording medium. Rather, *Canon* calls one support center, depending on the region the PC 100 is in, each support center only having software corresponding to that particular region.

For at least those reasons, Claim 4 is allowable.

Claims 13, 23 and 32 are allowable for similar reasons with regard to similar claim language.

Claims 5, 10, 14, 24, 29 and 30 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims.

Rejections of Claims 6-8, 15-17 and 25-27 over *Harding* in view of *Canon* in view of *Hanson*

Claims 6-8, 15-17 and 25-27 depend from allowable independent Claims 4, 13 and 23. *Hanson* does not remedy the deficiencies of those rejections and Claims 6-8, 15-17 and 25-27 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Rejections of Claims 9, 18, and 28 over *Harding* in view of *Canon* in view of *Garney*

Claims 9, 18 and 28 depend from Claims 4, 13 and 23, which are independent and allowable. *Garney* does not remedy the deficiencies of the rejections of Claims 4, 13 and 23 and Claims 9, 18 and 28 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing information, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections of the claims.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 9, 2006   By: _____
                                 Kevin B. McGoff
                                 Registration No. 59,297

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620